A Calmer View of the Sino-Indian Border Conflict, P. 2

JFK's Housing Order: A Reform The White Majority and Moneyed Interests Oppose, See Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. X, NO. 44 DECEMBER 3, 1962 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Cuba's Challenge to Our Sincerity on Inspection

A petty but significant instance indicates the attitude here on all matters Cuban. The CIA makes available to the press a daily transcript of radio broadcasts; it is enormously useful, for it contains many texts, particularly from Communist countries, which are nowhere else available. But when the Cuban government November 26 broadcast its formal reply to President Kennedy's press conference statement, the text did not appear next day in this daily service. The transcript for official use, otherwise identical with that given the press, *did* contain the Cuban text. Those pages were simply omitted from the volume as given out to newspapermen. *It is as if, with crucial negotiations still underway, the government did not want the press to see or report Cuba's side of the case as stated in its own words.* Not that the press would have paid much attention anyway. For that same afternoon, Nov. 27, the text was made public in New York as a United Nations document. No reference to it appeared on the wire services, and as this is written on the morning of the 28th I have yet to see it in the newspapers. The *New York Times* prints the texts of statements from Moscow and from Peking but not from Havana. It is only the big and the powerful to whom we give attention. Cuba is something we would like to trample under our feet.

What Do "Other Efforts" Mean?

There is a good reason for keeping the document from the American public. It has been conditioned to think of the Cuban leaders as some kind of lunatics. This constant brain washing would be interfered with if people read for themselves what the Cubans had to say. This latest document, as may be seen from the excerpt in the box on this page, has a dignity and an eloquence worthy of any big power's state papers. It also touches some tender spots, particularly on the question of international law, a subject on which we ordinarily like to lecture other countries, and on the question of ends justifying the means, on which we otherwise take a lofty position. The Cubans, in this formal statement signed by Castro and Dorticos, want to know what Kennedy meant by "other efforts" when he said that even if we give them a no-invasion pledge, "We will not, of course, abandon the political, economic and other efforts of this hemisphere" against Cuba. "What is meant by 'other efforts' against Cuba?", Havana asked. "Internal subversion, sabotage, acts of terrorism, pirate raids, infiltration by CIA agents, the landing and dropping of weapons in our territory, invasions by mercenaries—in fact everything which, in Pentagon jargon, is termed 'paramilitary' warfare."

Cuba says it will agree to UN inspection on its territory if the U.S. in return will let the UN "verify in the territory of the United States, in Puerto Rico and in other places where attacks on Cuba are in preparation, the dismantling of the training camps for mercenaries, spies, saboteurs and terrorists; of the centres where subversion is prepared; and of the bases from which pirate vessels set out from our coasts." If such reciprocal inspection were established, the Cuban note says, Cuba would "need no strategic weapons," its staff of foreign military technicians "would be reduced to the minimum" and "the necessary conditions would be created for the normal development of our relations with the countries of this hemisphere."

This, and its demand that we end the policy of economic strangulation, a policy in violation of international law and inter-American treaty, is the heart of the Cuban reply. It is no wonder the American government does not want it fully understood by our own people. It is a challenge to our bigness and a challenge to our sincerity. Inspection—we have stressed it over and over again—is the key word in all our peace and disarmament programs. Well, here is a chance to demonstrate it. We don't want strategic weapons in Cuba; the strategic weapons have been removed. We want to inspect and be sure. Cuba says she will allow inspection if we in turn allow the UN to verify the dismantling of the hostile camps aimed against her. What could be more fair? What better opportunity to give the world a demonstration in the application of our favorite panacea—mutual inspection? Or have we, in dealing with Cuba, given up fairness for force, in the immemorial manner of the strong confronting the weak?

Words Which Should Make Us Blush

"Respect for international law is an indispensable condition for the co-existence of the world's nations, independently of their social or economic systems. The only effective guarantee there is for maintaining international legality and guaranteeing obedience to the rules of law is respect by all nations for the established standards. In this hour of sharp confrontation between two conceptions of society, the United States has arrogated to itself the right to break existing international rules and establish new formulas at its own discretion. We believe that when this dangerous situation is reached and a country decides, entirely on its own, how it will apply the law in its relations with other countries of the world, there is no other course but to resist these pretensions firmly. The United States tries to dictate what kinds of weapons we must or must not have. North American leaders who forced us to spend vast resources to defend ourselves from the aggressions of which we have been the object for the four years of our Revolution's progress also want to be the judges to decide what must be the limit of the armament with which to defend our freedom."

—From Cuba's Appeal to the United Nations, Nov. 26.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Either A Strong China or A Strong Tibet Would Have The Same Border Claims

A Longer and Calmer View of the Dispute Between India and China

A few elementary observations may help us to keep a sense of balance in the Sino-Indian dispute. India and China enjoyed several millennia of peace in the past because they were too far apart to clash. In recent years a common struggle against Western imperialism brought them together, but once India had achieved her freedom, friction with China made its appearance. The Indians found the Chiang Kai-shek government haughty. The main point of friction was over Tibet which had been a British sphere of influence.

The Manchus were weak, and content with theoretical suzerainty over Tibet. But the upsurge of Chinese nationalism, first under the Kuomintang and then the Communists spelled trouble not only for Indian trading rights in Tibet but also for the control India had inherited from the British over the peoples related to the Tibetans in creed and race in Ladakh, Sikkim, Bhutan, Nepal and other frontier areas. Sun Yat-sen had called for a United Chinese Republic of "Manchus, Mongols, *Tibetans,* Tartars and Chinese. . . ." While the Tibetans have always struggled against China for autonomy and regarded Dr. Sun's formulation as Chinese imperialism, a strong Tibet would create similar border problems for India. H. E. Richardson's new *Short History of Tibet* reminds us that one of the first acts of the Tibetan regime after India became independent was to demand "the 'return' of what were described as 'Tibetan territories' from Assam to Ladakh. . . ."

A Long Abandoned Trail

The immediate issue between India and China lies in Ladakh where the Chinese built a road across the Aksai Chin plateau, its northeastern corner. This high, bleak land where, as Nehru once said, no people live and no blade of grass grows, is claimed by both China and India but neither had ever administered the area. The boundary had never been marked, though Ladakh passed to British control in the 1840s. The contested Aksai Chin region of Ladakh which juts out in an enclave between Tibet and Sinkiang is, according to Tibor Mende's *China and Her Shadow,* "inaccessible from the Indian side over the major part of the year." An old trail across Aksai Chin offers an all-year round route between Sinkiang (Chinese Turkestan) and Tibet but had "long been abandoned by traders and other travellers because of the dreaded summer heat and absence of water" (Asian Survey, Oct. 1962, Ladakh and the Sino-Indian Border Crisis by Margaret E. Fisher and Leo E. Rose).

Once before in the early 18th century the Dsungaris had used this route to invade Tibet from the West. The Chinese Communists used it in Oct. 1950 to occupy Tibet. From China the supply route through the Khampa country was turbulent with guerrillas. The best route, through the south, went through Indian controlled territory. The Aksai Chin offered the Chinese a supply route from the West under their control. It consolidated their hold on Tibet. They built a road across it in 1956-7 which the Indians did not learn about until two years later, itself a commentary on their claim that this was their territory. Indeed Chou En-lai in his Nov. 15 letter to the Afro-Asian bloc claimed, "It was only from a pictorial magazine published in China that the Indian government came to know that China had built the highway." Ever since the main trend of Sino-Indian negotiation and conflict, down to the present unilateral cease-fire, has been an effort by Peking to swap recognition of the British drawn McMahon line in the northeast if India in turn would recognize China's claim to the Aksai Chin area of Ladakh in the northwest.

This would exchange land useless to India for recognition of a boundary no Chinese government has ever accepted before. Indeed the Kuomintang regime on Formosa protested in recent weeks against U.S. support of the McMahon line. But nationalistic pride and warlike fever in Indian block a sensible settlement, as does the desire of our cold warriors to draw India into the cold war.

Grim Fact The US Press Hides

"Mr. Nehru is not the only Premier to whom the Chinese have set a puzzle. As the American and British military missions gather in Delhi, the West is startlingly confronted with the possibility that it could itself once again become involved in a war with China. . . . India has asked both America and Britain for combat equipment which no Indian at present is trained to use. This implies, if the war is to continue, that it will have to be used by Americans and British."

—New Delhi dispatch, London Observer Nov. 25.

How the Conflict Looked to Peking and Pakistan Before the Cease-Fire

"With India's present strong foreign backing it is now felt here [in Peking] that the conflict may simply 'hibernate' and flare up again with the spring thaw. A Chinese official told me disgustedly yesterday: 'As long as the Indians go on attacking us they will get anything they want from the United States. They're making millions of dollars out of these skirmishes. They'll probably go on forever.'

"The word 'skirmishes', while never used in official reports, is typical of the tendency which China has shown throughout, and still shows, to minimize the conflict. Newspaper coverage is more political than military, and even Chinese successes have constantly been played down. . . . On October 23, when the fighting was said to be at its height the Communist Party organ, the 'People's Daily', discussed agricultural problems . . . . It is considered certain by foreign observers that it was never China's intention to force a military decision and that her troops went into action only to impress upon India the wisdom of an early negotiated revision of the Sino-Indian border. . . .

"Now that talks have become most unlikely, China finds herself holding useless territory in the Eastern sector and still not in full control of those tracts she looks upon as rightfully hers in the West."

—Jacques Marcus of Agence France-Presse from Peking in the London Sunday Times, Nov. 4.

"He [President Ayub] has given a frank indication that India is making an exaggerated fuss about her conflict with China. This incidentally is an opinion shared by a number of Indians. New Delhi newspapers have commented astringently that the scale of frontier fighting does not justify the drastic expedient of declaring a state of emergency, nor warrant Mr. Nehru's gloomy comparisons with Dunkirk. Pakistanis . . . are united in believing that India is using the bogy of the Chinese Communist aggression to obtain Western arms for the purpose of blackmailing Pakistan." *—London Sunday Times from Karachi, Nov. 11.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How Do You Get A Reform The White Majority and Moneyed Interests Oppose?

Some of the Realities Behind JFK's Order Against Racial Housing Bars

The President's executive order against racial segregation in housing would be a good place to begin a class in the realities of American government. If the U.S. were a pure democracy, i.e. ruled by majority will, it is unlikely that such an order would be approved. The point on which the white majority in the North comes closest to the white majority in the South is in prejudice against having Negroes as neighbors. If the U.S. were simply ruled by a capitalist class, certainly no such order would have been issued. The upper reaches of American wealth are largely white, Protestant and Anglo-Saxon. Negroes are not the only group against which the gates of their exclusive suburbs have been shut by racial covenants.*

Obviously the wheels and pulleys of our political machinery are more complex than those conjured up by words like democratic or capitalist. The order reflects the rising power of a Negro minority holding the balance of power in many areas; foreign policy considerations *vis a vis* newly emerging African and Asian nations, *and* the influence—however imperfectly realized—of the national ideal, which is equality.

Only On and From the President

The order also tells us a good deal about the nature of the Presidency and the President. Congress would never pass such an order. It is not only that the Southerners occupy too many strategic committee posts. The white small town business man and lawyer who is the dominant element in Congress is the very type who has all along favored racial covenants in housing. It is only on the President that the equation of minority votes, foreign policy and national ideal could work. And it is only from the Presidency, with its vast reservoir of unspecified powers, that such an order could issue.

Again, the nature and timing of the order reveal the character of the President himself. In his campaign Kennedy challenged Eisenhower to wipe out discrimination in public housing "by a stroke of the pen" as recommended by the Civil Rights Commission 11 months earlier. But Kennedy himself waited 22 months before doing so. He waited until after election. Did he think it would hurt more in the South than it would help him in urban Negro areas? And with all his flair for publicity, he also—perhaps shrewdly sizing up the real feelings of the white majority—announced it on a day when the news was overshadowed by a victory over Castro.

The order, as issued, reflected Mr. Kennedy's innate and extreme caution. The order went beyond the Civil Rights Commission recommendations of 1959 to Eisenhower but fell short of the Commission's 1961 recommendations to Kennedy. The former were limited to public housing, while the Kennedy order goes beyond public to private housing financed by FHA and VA, or roughly a fourth of new housing starts. But the majority on the Commission wanted to extend the order to cover all financial institutions under Federal supervision in the home mortgage field: almost all the savings and loan institutions and most of the nation's banks. But of the two Southerners on the Commission, one dissented entirely from this recommendation while the other would have extended the order only to savings and loan associations. The order as issued followed the Commission's lowest common Southern denominator.

The limited character of the order may create difficulties in real estate; far-sighted men in the home financing field like Earl Schwulst of New York's Bowery Savings (the nation's largest mutual) wanted an across the board order. On the other hand, a more sweeping order might have created difficulties in the courts. Administration spokesmen have called this only a first step, and as such it represents progress. But it is still only the wealthier Negro few who will benefit by it. Most Negroes are still too poor for FHA or VA housing, and not many are eager, anyway, to subject themselves to slights from white neighbors.

***In a case uncovered by the Civil Rights Commission in its 1961 report on housing applicants for homes in Grosse Point, Mich., had to pass a screening system under which "a passing grade was 50 points. However, those of Polish descent had to score 55 points; southern Europeans, including those of Italian, Greek, Spanish or Lebanese origin had to score 65 points, and those of Jewish faith had to score 85 points. Negroes and Orientals were excluded altogether."**

A Subject in Which All Negroes Are Ph.D.'s

"We American Negroes know something about the difficulties of getting our nation to move on political, economic and social inequalities and injustices where race and color are involved. In fact most American Negroes, whether they be semi-literate or graduates of our finest colleges, are all doctors of philosophy on this issue." *—Roy Wilkins of the NAACP, Nov. 24.*

Four Years Experience in New York Allays White Fears, Sours Negro Hopes

"One builder the other day in a part of New York said he would be very much against the housing order because it would hurt his development, and he was reminded that there was a more stringent law in effect in New York at the time. So I think some of the fears have been exaggerated."

—President Kennedy at press conference, Nov. 21.

"Two cities, Pittsburgh and New York, have had ordinances prohibiting discrimination in the sale and rental of private housing for several years. . . . These are some conclusions after visiting Pittsburgh and New York:

"1. The number of Negroes who had used the law was infinitesimal. 2. Those Negroes who used the law were highly educated with high incomes; the great mass of Negroes had never heard of the law. 3. There had been few—in most cases, no—reprisals or adverse effects when Negroes have used the law to gain a home in a white area. Whites have not moved out. 4. Real estate dealers have developed techniques for getting around the law. . . ."

"In four years the [New York] Commission has satisfied only 437 complaints, nearly all from Negroes. Only 127 of those who claimed discrimination received the apartment or house they originally wanted. As one real estate man quipped, 'At that rate it would take about 16,500 years to integrate the 1.8 million apartment units in New York City. . . .'"

—From a survey by Staff Writer Hugh Wells in the Washington Evening Star, Nov. 22.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

San Francisco Chronicle's "Our Man Hoppe" Unveils A Most Fiendish Plot

Why Not Give The Kremlin A Peace Scare For A Change?

By Arthur Hoppe *

Sound the tocsins! Gird your loins! Man the battlements! We are face to face with another Peace Scare.

As you will recall, Peace Scares invariably follow War Threats. And while not quite as exciting, they're pretty awful. "Communists Launch Peace Offensive" shout the headlines and everybody gets mighty worried.

This time, the evidence of a Peace Scare is unmistakable. Mr. Khrushchev is saying what Russia needs is a little more Capitalism around there. Mr. Castro is going around moodily kicking the tires of his IL-28 bombers and claiming he wouldn't have any such lousy old merchandise cluttering up his parking lots. And over in India, just when Mr. Nehru was getting ready to defend pacifism to the last man, Red China says it was only kidding.

From Bomb Shelter to Broker's Office

Obviously, the whole thing is a Communist plot. All the experts agree on this. The experts have long since held the Communists do this to us to "keep us off balance." Which it certainly does. One minute we are all in our backyards digging shelters. And the next we are all down at our brokers selling our missile stocks. This is very hard on all of us.

So what do the experts advise when we are hit by a Peace Scare? They advise: "We must not let our guard down!" Or to vary things a little: "We must keep our guard up!"

Thus we always keep our guard up. Which now costs us $50 billion a year. And while this is very good for missile stocks, I, personally, am getting a bit jangled from being buffeted this way and that by Communist War Threats and Communist Peace Scares.

So out of sheer jittery irritability I have come up with a fiendishly clever plan: This time, when we consider what to do with our guard, let's drop it.

First, Mr. Kennedy announces that what we need is a little Communism around here. Prime Minister Macmillan promptly denounces him as "an Adam Smith revisionist." If not a "Norman Thomas deviationary." And headlines bloom in Pravda about the "irreconcilable split in the Capitalistic bloc."

This sets the stage. Next, a group of young Turkish officers inspect those old Jupiter missiles we gave them. After thumping the sides and slamming the doors they angrily demand we remove these rusty junkpiles from their landscape. Izvestia nervously decries this as "a typical Wall Street power play."

As a final fillip, we withdraw all our troops 12.5 miles from Miami, toss half our nuclear bombs in the ocean and convert the Pentagon into Disneyland East. Which wouldn't cost very much.

Talk about Peace Scares! This would frighten the Kremlin witless. "What are those Capitalist imperialists up to now?" Mr. Khrushchev would mumble between gnawn nails. "What secret threat lies behind these devious machinations!" And he would toss and turn twice as much nightly as we are now.

Yes, sir, let's give those Communists a taste of their own medicine. But meanwhile, remember: It's perfectly logical to be scared of peace these days. Just don't panic.

Intellectuals We Can Do Without

"One of the young defense intellectuals tried to explain this 'counterforce doctrine' in simple terms: 'This country and the Soviet Union are like two men with cocked pistols. Both know that if one trigger is pulled the other will be pulled. Both want to be able to aim at the heart. But both have a mutual interest in avoiding death. So both will want to be able to aim at the shoulder, say, or the hand holding the pistol, as in one of those duels where both duelists want to stop short of killing. The trouble is, of course, that to hit the shoulder and not the heart you've got to have a damn good aim. And if you aim at the shoulder, and the other fellow aims at your heart, you've got to have another bullet left to aim at his heart."

—Saturday Evening Post's Stewart Alsop explaining McNamara's New Strategy, Dec. 1.

And if both sides only hit each other's "shoulder"? What do they do? Shake hands and try peaceful coexistence? Or what if both sides use that "second bullet"? What do we do then? Call off the game on account of (radioactive) rain? We never thought we'd live to long for the days when the Pentagon was run by just plain safely unintellectual brass hats.

* From the San Francisco Chronicle, Nov. 22.

Remember Our Standing Offer of Free Sample Copies To Friends If You Send Stamped Long Envelopes

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

12/3/62

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except during August and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED